

**Application
for a
PUBLIC FACILITY**

Idaho Community Development Block Grant

**By the
City of Emmett**



November 20, 2009
William Butticci
Mayor

Prepared by:

Shawn Charters Consulting 139 S. Commercial Avenue, Emmett, ID 83617 (208) 741-1113

OFFICIAL LETTERHEAD

November 18, 2009

Donald A. Dietrich, Director
Idaho Department of Commerce
P. O. Box 83720
Boise, ID 83720-0093

Dear Mr. Dietrich:

The City of Emmett respectfully submits this application for an Idaho Community Development Block Grant. The City has worked diligently for several years to get our water and sewer systems upgraded. The City has completed a Water Quality Pilot Study and is ready to proceed.

The total project cost for the water system upgrade project is \$2,777,000. The City passed a bond and is committing \$2,277,000 in matching funds to complete the needed improvements.

We are very excited about improving our water system for our residences and businesses. We appreciate your concern and attention to our grant request and look forward to answering any questions you might have.

Sincerely,

William Butticci
Mayor

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | <u>Page</u> |
|--|--------------------|
| Applicant Information | 3 |
| EAC Page | 4 |
| Threshold Factors | 5 |
| Eligible Applicant | |
| Eligible Activity | |
| National Objective | |
| Citizens Participation Plan | |
| Statewide Goals and Strategy | |
| Administrative Capacity | |
| Fair Housing | |
| Anti-Displacement Plan | |
| Program Income | 7 |
| Project Description | 7 |
| Budget Narrative | 12 |
| Budget Form | 14 |
| Detailed Cost Analysis | 15 |
| Project Schedule | 16 |
| Grantee and Sub-recipient Financial Profiles | 17 |
| Environmental Scoping – Field Notes Checklist | 20 |
| Review and Ranking Criteria | 24 |
| Certifications | 28 |
| Appendix | 29 |
| Appendix A – LMI Income Survey | |
| Appendix B - Public Hearing Notice, Publication & Minutes of Public Hearing | |
| Appendix C – RFP for Professional Services | |
| Appendix D – Fair Housing Resolution | |
| Appendix E – Project Maps / Site Photos / Plans | |
| Appendix F – Water Pilot Study | |
| Appendix G – Cost Factors/Documentation of Match | |
| Appendix H – Letters of Support | |

IV. ICDBG Application Information Form

Applicant: City of Emmett Chief Elected Official: William Butticci
Address: 501 E. Main Street, Emmett, ID 83617 Phone: 365-6050

Sub recipient (if applicable): NA Chief Elected Official: _____
Address: _____ Phone: _____

Application Prepared by Shawn Charters Phone: 741-1113
Address: 124 W. Main Street, Emmett, ID 83617
Architect/Engineer/Planner John Blom, Holladay Engineering Phone: 642-3304
Address: 32 N. Main Street, Payette, ID 83661

NATIONAL OBJECTIVE (MARK ONE)

☒ LMI Area ☐ LMI Clientele ☐ Imminent Threat
☐ LMI Jobs ☐ Slum & Blight

PROJECT TYPE (MARK ONE)

☒ Public Facility/ Housing ☐ Community Center
☐ Economic Development ☐ Senior Center

PROJECT POPULATION TO BENEFIT (PERSONS): (Census/Survey/Clients/Jobs)

TOTAL # TO BENEFIT: 5,981 (2004 Update) TOTAL # LMI TO BENEFIT: 3,815

% LMI TO BENEFIT: 63.8 % % MINORITY POPULATION: 14.3 %

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: This application is for a \$500,000 ICDBG grant to correct deficiencies in the water system by installing a greensand filter, consolidating the water supply and modifying the operation of the water system for the City of Emmett.

| SOURCE | AMOUNT | DATE APPLICATION SUBMITTED | RESERVED/ CONDITIONAL AWARD | FUNDS COMMITTED/ CONTRACT AWARD DATE | DOCUMENTATION IN APPENDIX *** |
|-------------------------|-----------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| ICDBG | 500,000 | | | | |
| Local Cash | | | | | |
| Local Loan* | 2,277,000 | | | 8/4/09 | J |
| Local In-Kind** | | | | | |
| USDA RD Grant | | | | | |
| EDA Grant | | | | | |
| State Grant | | | | | |
| Foundation Grant | | | | | |
| Private Investment | | | | | |
| Other (identify) | | | | | |
| TOTAL PROJECT FINANCING | 2,777,000 | | | | |

* Identify Loan Source(s) Bond Date Bond or Necessary and Ordinary Passed August 4, 2009

**Describe In-Kind match by type (i.e. materials, labor, waived fees, land value) and amount.

***Identify which appendix corresponding documentation is in. Documentation should be a letter from the appropriate source.

V. **Economic Advisory Council Page:**

The City of Emmett has completed their multi-million dollar sewer treatment plant upgrade project. This project has taken much time and resources from the City. Now the City is faced with a major Water Quality issue. The City has hired Holladay Engineering to conduct a Water Quality Study which is included in **Appendix F**. The results of the study demonstrated that drinking water supplied from three groundwater wells (Wells 6, 8, and 9) for the City of Emmett has odor and color that generates considerable consumer complaints. The drinking water contains:

- Sulfides that are suspected to contribute to hydrogen sulfide odors and black color,
- Sulfates that may potentially revert to sulfides in the water distribution system and create odors,
- Iron and manganese concentrations that may contribute to yellow and black color, and
- High free chlorine levels that imparts chlorine taste.

Hydrogen sulfide odors are very apparent at the well head of Well No.8 and are having an obvious affect on water users. Iron concentrations do not exceed the National Secondary Drinking Water Regulations (secondary standards) of 0.3 mg/l for color control. However, manganese levels slightly exceed the secondary standards (.05 mg/l) for color control in Well No. 8 and significantly exceed the standard in Well No. 9.

The City of Emmett discontinues use of Well No. 8 during low demand periods to minimize complaints to the City. The City is regularly reimbursing users for clothing that have been stained by the City water. In addition, the City has an extensive flushing protocol throughout the year to try and minimize the effects of odor and staining on users.

This project will directly impact the entire population of the City of Emmett which is comprised of 63.8% low and moderate income individuals. Many of the residents are on a fixed income and cannot afford to fully fund the entire \$2,777,000 needed to fix the water quality problems. Currently the City is getting barraged with angry residents demanding the City pay for damages to the laundry and household appliances. If the project is not completed the City will continue to provide dirty and smelly water which may result in health and safety violations and is certainly an impediment to attracting new businesses.

VI. Threshold Criteria

A. Eligible Applicant:

The applicant is a city ☒ The applicant is a county ☐

B. Eligible Activities:

List the eligible activities, identified in Chapter 2, that are a part of the project.

The proposed project includes designing and constructing infrastructure improvements to the city's water system. The activities are eligible under ICDBG Section II, B, Public Facilities and Improvements.

C. National Objective: There are six National Objectives listed below. Complete only the National Objective that will be met with the project.

An Income Survey was conducted and can be found in **Appendix A**. The survey resulted in 61% of the population as being low to moderate income and benefiting from this project, thus meeting HUD's National Objective.

C.1. LMI-Area Benefit:

Total Number of Households* in Project Benefit Area 2,123

***Note: For water and sewer projects, this is the number of households hooked onto the system and any households that will hook onto the system once the project is complete.**

LMI Percentage Determined by: (Check one and complete requested information)

X Survey** (survey requirements in Chapter 3)

Survey Report, Sample Survey, Survey
Tabulation, Boundary Map*** are found in
Appendix I.

 Census (BG=Block Group) List the BG for each tract

Tract BG BG BG BG

Tract BG BG BG BG

Tract BG BG BG BG

** Survey methodology and documents must have prior approval from ICL staff

***Survey Area must match Project Benefit Area

D. Citizen Participation:

The City of Emmett has adopted a Citizen Participation Plan and stands by its commitment to comply with the Plan. A notice of public hearing was published on October 28, 2009, with the public hearing being held on November 10, 2009 at the Emmett City Hall. Copies of the Notice of Public Hearing, Affidavit of Publication, and official minutes of the hearing are included as **Appendix B** to this grant application.

Date of Notice October 28, 2009

Date of Hearing November 10, 2009

E. Statewide Goal and Strategy: (✓check applicable)

Check the goal and strategy that best corresponds to the project.

- ☐ Increased access to decent affordable housing (goal)
 - ☐ Sustain and increase homeownership (strategy)
 - ☐ Sustain and increase affordable rental housing (strategy)
 - ☐ Support equal access to a continuum of housing services (strategy)
- ☒ Preserved and enhances suitable living environments (goal)
 - ☐ Improve safety and livability of communities (strategy)
Example – consent order
 - ☐ Increase access to quality facilities and services (strategy)
Example – new construction
 - ☒ Improve affordability and sustainability of quality facilities and services
Example – rehab or renovation
- ☐ Expanding economic opportunities (goal)
 - ☐ Create jobs primarily for low- and moderate-income persons (strategy)
 - ☐ Prioritize projects that provide a living wage and fringe benefits (strategy)
 - ☐ Revitalize downtown business districts (strategy)

F. Administrative Capacity:

1. Applicant Capacity: Over the past few years the City of Emmett has been the recipient of Idaho Community Development Block Grant Funding and has successfully managed all projects with no monitoring findings.

2. Grant Administrator: The City of Emmett does not have adequate City staff certified to administer the Idaho Community Development Block Grant. An administrative contract with an Idaho Commerce and Labor approved administrator has been established for this project using state and federal (OMB A-102) procurement procedures. Shawn Charters Consulting has been selected to perform the grant administration on this project. Please see **Appendix C** for a copy of the RFP for Administrative Services and selection letter. Any necessary legal services will be provided by the City's legal counsel.

G. Fair Housing:

The City has adopted a Fair Housing Resolution, Residential Anti-displacement and Relocation Assistance Plan and Policy on Non-Discrimination. Please see **Appendix D** for copies of the resolution. The City has designated April as Fair Housing Month

and the Fair Housing Resolution has been published numerous times in the past, the most recent being in April, 2008.

H. Anti-Displacement Resolution:

The City has adopted and published the Residential Anti-Displacement and Relocation Assistance Plan and has also signed the Grant Certification Page.

VII. Program Income: Describe if the project will generate program income and the reuse plan.

No program income will be generated as a result of this project.

VIII. A. General Project Description: Include the general project description as outlined in the narrative for this section. Be sure to address all the required details.

Community Description:

Gem County, created in 1915, is located 30 miles northwest of Boise and is known as “The Valley of Plenty”. Emmett, the County Seat and only municipality in Gem County, is situated along the Payette River in the southern portion of the county. In the early 1900’s fruit packers adopted the label of “Gem of Plenty” because of the fertility of the valley. During the mining era the valley was known as the “garden” for the mining regions. Today, Emmett remains the Valley of Plenty offering plenty of wide-open spaces, plenty of recreational opportunities and plenty of friends waiting to welcome you for a day or a life time.

The economy of Gem County is based primarily on farming, timber and mineral products. Irrigation makes the county a virtual cornucopia of agricultural products. In addition to dairy, eggs, fruit, grains, corn, alfalfa, beef and other livestock, many smaller farms and gardens produce vegetables, melons and grapes.



Economic factors have contributed to the loss of many orchards to other crops or subdivisions. Tourism and small industry are both growing in the area. Until recently logging, a plywood plant and lumber kiln made up most of the timber industry in Gem County. A sand plant processes and ships top quality silica sand, excavated from the hills south of Emmett. Other small industries, that manufacture items varying from furniture to saddles, make the valley their home.

Some facts about Emmett are:

- Emmett was originally known as Martinsville
- The City of Emmett was incorporated in 1909
- The City encompasses 1.8 square miles
- Emmett is located approximately 30 miles NW of Boise, Idaho
- The population of Emmett was 5,490 in 2000 (US Census Bureau)
- Emmett enjoys four distinct seasons
- Emmett is home to the Emmett Cherry Festival; one of Idaho's largest, longest running events
- Emmett is a "Community of Promise" (America's Promise Alliance), since 2003
- Emmett has been designated a "Tree City USA" since 2002
- In 2009 Emmett was designated as a "Heritage City" for its rich historic background.

The City of Emmett has been diligently working on upgrading and improving their public facilities. The City has addressed its I & I improvements and is has upgraded their sewer system into compliance with EPA Standards. The City is now experiencing serious water quality issues with two of the City wells. This project will bring much needed improvements to the system.

Project Description:

Drinking water supplied from three groundwater wells (Wells 6, 8, and 9) for the City of Emmett has odor and color that generates considerable consumer complaints. The drinking water contains:

- Sulfides that are suspected to contribute to hydrogen sulfide odors and black color,
- Sulfates that may potentially revert to sulfides in the water distribution system and create odors,
- Iron and manganese concentrations that may contribute to yellow and black color, and
- High free chlorine levels that imparts chlorine taste.

Hydrogen sulfide odors are very apparent at the well head of Well No.8 and are having an obvious affect on water users. Iron concentrations do not exceed the National Secondary Drinking Water Regulations (secondary standards) of 0.3 mg/l for color control. However, manganese levels slightly exceed the secondary

standards (.05 mg/l) for color control in Well No. 8 and significantly exceed the standard in Well No. 9. The following tables show the water testing results.

| Table No. 1 Well 8 Water Quality | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|------------|----------------|-----------------|---------------------|---------|---------|
| Date | Total Iron | Dissolved Iron | Total Manganese | Dissolved Manganese | Sulfate | Sulfide |
| 7/23/2007 | 0.08 | <0.05 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 3 | 1.75 |
| (dup) 7/23/2007 | 0.24 | 0.11 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 4 | 1.5 |
| 8/22/2007 | <0.05 | <0.05 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 3 | 1.5 |
| (dup) 8/22/2007 | <0.05 | <0.05 | 0.06 | 0.05 | 3 | 1.5 |
| 1/10/2008 | 0.09 | <0.05 | <0.05 | <0.05 | 3 | 0.25 |
| 7/25/2008 | <0.05 | <0.05 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 5 | 2.25 |

| Table No. 2 Well 9 Water Quality | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|------------|----------------|-----------------|---------------------|---------|---------|
| Date | Total Iron | Dissolved Iron | Total Manganese | Dissolved Manganese | Sulfate | Sulfide |
| 7/23/2007 | 0.06 | 0.12 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 24 | <0.05 |
| 8/22/2007 | <0.05 | 0.14 | 0.18 | 0.21 | 24 | <0.05 |
| 1/10/2008 | <0.05 | 0.09 | 0.19 | 0.2 | 23 | <0.05 |

Recent pilot testing of various water treatment technologies revealed:

- aeration with pH adjustment will remove approximately 98% of the hydrogen sulfide, and
- heavy chlorine disinfection (oxidation) with greensand filtration will remove the remaining sulfur and 95% of the manganese concentrations.

PHASE 1: This phase would be to use one green sand filter located at the Well No. 8 site to treat both wells for odor and color. This phase of the project is being addressed through this application for ICDBG funding.

- Consolidate the water supply at one site. This will involve the construction of a water main from the Well No. 9 site to the Well No. 8 site.
- Construct a green sand filter for use by Well No. 8 and No. 9. The green sand filtration will be effective in the absorption of manganese from both wells. However, the sulfide in Well No. 8 will be oxidized to sulfur with chlorine so that the sulfur precipitate can be filtered in the filter. This will significantly reduce the run time of the filter to approximately 8 hours with a 30 minute backwash.
- The operation of the water system will be modified to rely more significantly upon the 1 million storage reservoir. Well No. 8 & 9 will be utilizing the same filter. The effect on the water system will be to reduce the available raw water system. It is anticipated that the run continuously through peak system demand periods. Provision will be added into the design to allow for both wells to pump into the system directly during an unusually high water demand period.

| Table 3 Estimated Construction Costs for Water Treatment System for Phase 1 (Preferred) | | | |
|---|--|----------|-------------|
| Item No. | Item Description | Quantity | Cost |
| 1 | Mobilization | 1 | \$206,000 |
| 2 | Well No. 9 to 8 Transmission Line | 1 | \$363,000 |
| 3 | Greensand Filtration- Well No. 8 (12 ft dia, 44 ft horizontal length) | 1 | \$1,650,000 |
| 4 | Install Piping to Sanitary Sewer | 1 | \$123,000 |
| Contingency | | | \$135,000 |
| Subtotal | | | \$2,477,000 |
| Engineering & Construction Admin. | | | \$250,000 |
| Grant Administration | | | \$40,000 |
| Legal | | | \$10,000 |
| TOTAL | | | \$2,777,000 |
| Note: No equipment redundancy provided | | | |

PHASE 2: This phase would be to construct the aeration improvements for removal of the sulfides from Well No. 8 to increase the efficiency of the green sand filter and to allow for more treated water supply to the distribution system and to construct a water storage reservoir.

| Table 4 Estimated Construction Costs for Water Treatment System for Phase 2 | | | |
|---|---|----------|-------------|
| Item No. | Item Description | Quantity | Cost |
| 1 | Mobilization | 1 | \$135,000 |
| 2 | Booster Pump and Enclosure (20 ft width x 20 ft length x 10 ft height) | 1 | \$250,000 |
| 3 | Aeration Tower with pH Adjustment (8 ft dia, 21ft vertical height) | 1 | \$400,000 |
| 4 | Bio Towers for Gas Scrubbing (3 ft dia, 18 ft vertical height) | 1 | \$100,000 |
| 5 | Chemical Adjustment | 1 | \$100,000 |
| 6 | 2 million gallon Storage Reservoir | 1 | \$1,500,000 |
| 7 | Facility Piping | 1 | \$100,000 |
| Subtotal | | | \$2,785,000 |
| Estimated Design Engineering | | | \$270,000 |
| Estimated Construction Inspection | | | \$118,000 |
| Estimated Legal & Administration | | | \$57,000 |
| COE Management | | | \$151,000 |
| TOTAL | | | \$3,181,000 |
| Note: No equipment redundancy provided | | | |

This project will directly impact the entire population of the City of Emmett which is comprised of 61% low and moderate income individuals. Many residents are on a fixed income and cannot afford to fund the entire \$5,958,000 needed to fix the water quality and storage problems. Currently, the City is getting barraged with angry residents demanding the City pay for damages to their laundry and household appliances. If the project is not completed the City will continue to have inadequate water storage and to provide dirty and smelly water which may result in health and safety violations.

B. Project Property & Permits: Answer the following questions and attach documentation.

1. Has any property and easements been purchased for this project? ☐ Yes ☒ No
If yes, does the applicant have title to the property? ☐ Yes ☐ No
Provide copy of deed in Appendix.
2. Will any property be needed for this project? ☐ Yes ☒ No
Status of the purchase: _____
Estimated date of final purchase: _____
What funds will be used to make purchase? _____
3. Will any easements/or rights-of-way be needed for this project? ☐ Yes ☒ No
Status of the purchase: _____
Estimated date of final purchase: _____
What funds will be used to make purchase? _____
4. Is anyone living on the land or in the structures at the proposed site? ☐ Yes ☒ No
5. Is any business being conducted on the land or in the structures at the proposed site? ☐ Yes ☒ No
6. Are there any businesses, individuals, or farms being displaced as a result of this project?
☐ Yes ☒ No
7. Are there permits that will be needed for the project, i.e., well, water rights, land application, demolition permits, zoning permit, air quality permit, etc? ☒ Yes ☐ No

Status of the permits (include plan for securing permits and estimation of issue completion date): DEQ permits will be submitted in February 2010 to allow for construction to begin August 2010.
8. Describe the ownership or lease arrangements for the property involved in the project.
All construction is within the Public Right of Way

IX. Budget Narrative: Describe the source and status of all funding for the project according to the instructions in Part A of this Chapter.

Holladay Engineering has recommended a Phased approach to the City's Water Improvement Project. Phase I improvements are estimated to be \$2,777,000 and will be funded with City Loan Funds from a Bond that was approved August 5, 2009. The balance of the costs will be funded with ICDBG funds if this application is approved.

Applications have been made to the US Army Corp of Engineers for 595 funding and USDA Rural Development for Grant Funds to complete the Phase II improvements. Total Cost for both Phase I and II is \$5,958,000. Please see **Appendix G** for a detailed and stamped cost estimate.

| Table 3 Estimated Construction Costs for Water Treatment System for Phase 1 (Preferred) | | | |
|---|--|----------|-------------|
| Item No. | Item Description | Quantity | Cost |
| 1 | Mobilization | 1 | \$206,000 |
| 2 | Well No. 9 to 8 Transmission Line | 1 | \$363,000 |
| 3 | Greensand Filtration- Well No. 8 (12 ft dia, 44 ft horizontal length) | 1 | \$1,650,000 |
| 4 | Install Piping to Sanitary Sewer | 1 | \$123,000 |
| Contingency | | | \$135,000 |
| Subtotal | | | \$2,477,000 |
| Engineering & Construction Admin. | | | \$250,000 |
| Grant Administration | | | \$40,000 |
| Legal | | | \$10,000 |
| TOTAL | | | \$2,777,000 |
| Note: No equipment redundancy provided | | | |

| Table 4 Estimated Construction Costs for Water Treatment System for Phase 2 | | | |
|---|---|----------|-------------|
| Item No. | Item Description | Quantity | Cost |
| 1 | Mobilization | 1 | \$135,000 |
| 2 | Booster Pump and Enclosure (20 ft width x 20 ft length x 10 ft height) | 1 | \$250,000 |
| 3 | Aeration Tower with pH Adjustment (8 ft dia, 21ft vertical height) | 1 | \$400,000 |
| 4 | Bio Towers for Gas Scrubbing (3 ft dia, 18 ft vertical height) | 1 | \$100,000 |
| 5 | Chemical Adjustment | 1 | \$100,000 |
| 6 | 2 million gallon Storage Reservoir | 1 | \$1,500,000 |

| | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|-------------|
| 7 | Facility Piping | 1 | \$100,000 |
| Subtotal | | | \$2,785,000 |
| Estimated Design Engineering | | | \$270,000 |
| Estimated Construction Inspection | | | \$118,000 |
| Estimated Legal & Administration | | | \$57,000 |
| COE Management | | | \$151,000 |
| TOTAL | | | \$3,181,000 |
| Note: No equipment redundancy provided | | | |

X. Idaho Community Development Block Grant Budget Form

(Use only line items on pages V-7 & V-8)

Applicant or Grantee: City of Emmett**Project Name:** Water Improvement Project

| LINE ITEMS | CDBG | Cash | City In-Kind | Federal | State | Private Cash | Private In-Kind | Total |
|----------------------|----------------|------------------|-----------------|---------|-------|-----------------|--------------------|------------------|
| Administrative** | 40,000 | | | | | | | 40,000 |
| Design Professional | 250,000 | | | | | | | 250,000 |
| Planning | | | | | | | | |
| Construction | 210,000 | 2,267,000 | | | | | | 2,477,000 |
| Legal & Audit | | 10,000 | | | | | | 10,000 |
| Equipment | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL COSTS** | 500,000 | 2,277,000 | | | | | | 2,777,000 |

*Identify funding source

**Administrative expenses and project planning design costs, when totaled, shall not exceed 10 percent of the total I

XI. Detailed Cost Analysis

1. Have preliminary plans and specs been submitted to regulatory agencies for review?

___ Yes X No

If yes, list date submitted: _____

If no, list expected date to be submitted: _____

2. Has final design (for bidding) begun?

___ Yes X No

If yes, % complete: _____%

If no, what is expected start date: January 2010

3. Will project include bid alternatives to meet project budget if necessary?

X Yes ___ No

4. Are Davis Bacon wage rates applicable to the project?

X Yes ___ No

If yes, are they included in the project costs?

X Yes ___ No

5. Have known environmental measures been included in project costs? (ex: dust mitigation, archaeological survey, storm water drainage, wetland mitigation etc.)

X Yes ___ No

6. List the last date the owner and design professional discussed project design and details.

Date: 11/10/09

7. Design Professional Cost Estimate may be found in **Appendix G**.

XII. Project Schedule

| Project Activity | Date (to be) Completed | Documentation in Appendix |
|--|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Design Professional Contract Executed | November 2009 | B |
| Grant Administration Contract Executed | November 2009 | B |
| Environmental Release | April 2010 | |
| Bid Document Approval | July 2010 | |
| Bid Opening | August 2010 | |
| Construction Contract Executed | August 2010 | |
| Start Construction | September 2010 | |
| Construction 50% Complete | October 2010 | |
| Second Public Hearing | October 2010 | |
| Construction 100% Complete | December 2010 | |
| Update Fair Housing Plan | December 2010 | |
| Update 504 Review and Transition Plan | December 2010 | |
| Certificate of Substantial Completion | December 2010 | |
| Final Closeout | February 2011 | |

| Name of Professional and Agency Contacts | Firm/Agency | Phone with extension |
|---|---|-----------------------------|
| Examples: | | |
| Design Professional | John Blom, Holladay Engineering | 642-3304 |
| Funding Agency | Sharon Deal, IDOC | 334-2470 |
| Funding Agency | Heath Price, USDA RD | 454-8691 |
| Environmental Officer | Shawn Charters Consulting | 731-1113 |
| Permits | John Blom, Holladay Engineering | 642-3304 |
| Mayor | William Butticci, City of Emmett | 365-6050 |
| Public Works Director | Bruce Evans, City of Emmett | 365-6050 |
| Grant Writer/Administrator | Shawn Charters | 741-1113 |
| Bond Counsel | Mike Moore, Moore, Smith & Buxton & Turcke | 331-1800 |
| City Clerk | Marge Lawrence | 365-6050 |

XIII. Grantee and Sub-recipient Financial Profiles

Is the Grantee a (circle one) City County

If a sub-recipient, what type of Organization (circle one)

Water District Sewer District Homeowner's Association
For-Profit Company Non-Profit Company Water Association
Fire District Hospital District
Other (please explain): _____

Section I. Water System (only) – Input information for the water system (entity) that is expected to utilize the Idaho Community Block Grant funds.

Water Source(s): ___ Wells ___ River ___ Lake ___ Springs ___ Purchase ___ Other

Water Treatment Method: _____

Number of people served by the system _____
Number of hook-ups on the system _____
Number of equivalent dwelling units
(EDU's) on the system _____
Number of residential EDUs _____
Number of commercial EDUs _____
Number of industrial EDUs _____
Are all system users on meters _____

For residential users, what is the average monthly
water rate for 10,000 gallons \$ _____
What will be the new monthly rate after the project is
complete based on 10,000 gallons \$ _____
When was the last rate increase _____
How much were the rates increased \$ _____

Annual water system revenue \$ _____

Total dollar amount owed by customers in arrears \$ _____

Annual water system expenses \$ _____
Residential Hook-Up Fee \$ _____
Commercial Hook-up Fee \$ _____
Industrial Hook-Up Fee \$ _____

Identify outstanding indebtedness:

| Years remaining | Annual Payment | Lender |
|-----------------|----------------|--------|
| _____ | _____ | _____ |
| _____ | _____ | _____ |
| _____ | _____ | _____ |

Explain Water Conservation Methods Implemented: _____

Section II. Sewer System (only – Input information for the sewer system (entity) that is expected to utilize the Idaho Community Block Grant funds.

Sewer Treatment Method _____

Do you have a Pre-treatment system? ____ Yes ____ No

Number of people served by the system _____

Number of residential connection on the system _____

Number of commercial connection on the system _____

Number of industrial connection on the system _____

Number of new connections within the last year _____

What are the current residential sewer rates \$ _____

When was the last rate increase _____

How much were the rates increased \$ _____

Residential Connection Fee \$ _____

Commercial Connection Fee \$ _____

Industrial Connection Fee \$ _____

Annual sewer system revenue \$ _____

Current dollar amount owned by customers in arrears \$ _____

Annual sewer system expenses \$ _____

Identify outstanding indebtedness:

Years remaining

Annual Payment

Lender

**Section III. All Applicants (except Sewer and Water):
Grantee or Sub-Recipient Taxing Authority:**

A. Identify how the organization obtains its operating funding, i.e., bonds, district assessments, other: _____

B. Does the organization have taxing authority? ____ Yes ____ No (if no, skip to Section IV)

1. Do you tax? ____ Yes ____ No

a) If yes:

(1)

What is the tax rate? _____

(2)

What is the annual tax amount generated? _____

(3)

What are the taxes used to pay for, i.e., equipment, operating expenses, etc.? _____

2. If your organization does not tax explain why. _____

Section IV. All Applicants
Land Use Planning

When was the comprehensive plan last updated? _____

Which of the following tools do you implement as land use measures and controls?

| | Yes | No |
|-------------------------|-------|-------|
| Building Codes | _____ | _____ |
| Historical Preservation | _____ | _____ |
| Zoning Ordinances | _____ | _____ |

Do you currently implement any of the following?

| | Yes | No |
|---------------------------|-------|-------|
| Economic Development Plan | _____ | _____ |
| Development Impact Fees | _____ | _____ |
| Local Option Tax (resort) | _____ | _____ |
| Tree City USA | _____ | _____ |

XVIII. ICDBG Environmental Scoping - Field Notes Checklist

Applicant City of Emmett **Sub-Recipient** _____

This site and desk review checklist is to be completed by the Applicant and submitted with the application.

The purpose of the checklist is to help the Applicant and IDC better understand what environmental statutes or provisions per 24 CFR 58 might impact the proposed project. The information will assist in understanding what studies, documentation, and mitigation measures could be applicable and to assist in completing the environmental review record. The Applicant may choose to attach this scoping checklist as part of the environmental review record.

1. Limitations on Activities

Is the Grantee planning or in the process of acquiring property for this proposed project? ___ Yes X No

If yes, is the Applicant aware that land acquired or site work after submission of the ICDBG application is subject to 24 CFR 58.22 Limitation on Activities Requiring Clearance? Meaning once an application for ICDBG funds is submitted, neither Applicant or sub recipient, may commit Non-HUD funds to a project for land acquisition or site work (except for minor testing) before the environmental review is complete, unless the land acquisition or contract is conditioned on completion of the ICDBG environmental review.

2. Historic Preservation

Has the SHPO or THPO been notified of the project? ___ Yes X No

Have tribes with possible cultural and religious sites been notified of the project? X Yes X No

3. Floodplain Management

Is the project located within a floodway or floodplain designated on a current FEMA map? Check Web site www.store.msc.fema.gov ___ Yes X No ___ Not Sure

If yes what is the floodplain map number? _____

If , the project is located in a floodway or floodplain is the community where the project is taking place a participant in the National Flood Insurance Program. Check Web site www.idwr.idaho.gov/water/flood ___ Yes ___ No

4. Wetland Protection

Are there ponds, marshes, bogs, swamps, drainage ways, streams, rivers, or other wetlands on or near the site? ___ Yes X No

If yes, has the Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) been notified? ___ Yes ___ No

Has the Corps indicated what permit level will be required? ___ Yes ___ No ___ N/A

5. Sole Source Aquifers (Clean Water Act)

Is the proposed project located over an EPA designated aquifer area? ___ Yes X No
(check website www.epa.gov/safewater/ssanp.html)

Is it known at this time if construction will disturb more than one acre of land? ___ Yes X No

If yes, has a general permit for storm water discharges from construction sites been applied for from the EPA? ___ Yes ___ No

6. Endangered Species Act

Has U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, NOAA Fisheries, and Idaho Fish and Game Regional Office been notified about the project? ___ Yes X No

7. Wild and Scenic Rivers Act

Is the project located within one mile of a designated wild and scenic river? Idaho wild and scenic rivers include portions of the St. Joe, Lochsa, Selway, Middle Fork of the Clearwater, Snake, Rapid, and Middle Fork of the Salmon. Check Web site www.nps.gov/rivers/ ___ Yes X No

8. Clean Air Act

Is the project located in a designated non-attainment area for criteria air pollutants? ___ Yes X No

For building demolition or improvements has an asbestos analysis been planned for or conducted?
___ Yes ___ No X N/A

For housing rehabilitation has a lead based paint assessment been planned for or conducted?
___ Yes ___ No X N/A

9. Farmland Protection Policy Act

Is the project located on a site currently zoned as residential, commercial, and/or industrial ?
X Yes ___ No

Is the project area currently being utilized for farm or agricultural purposes ? ___ Yes X No

If yes, has the USDA Natural Resource Conservation Service or local planning department been notified about the project? ___ Yes ___ No

10. Environmental Justice

Does project have a disproportionate environmental impact on low income or minority populations?
___ Yes X No

11. Noise Abatement and Control

Is the project new construction or rehabilitation of noise sensitive use (i.e. housing, mobile home parks, nursing homes, hospitals, and other uses where quiet is integral to the project functions)?
___ Yes X No

If yes is the project located within 5 miles of an airport, 1000 feet of a major highway or busy road, or 3,000 feet of a railroad. ___ Yes ___ No

12. Explosive and Flammable Operations

Is the physical structure (not necessarily infrastructure) intended for residential, institutional, recreational, commercial or industrial use? ☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, are there any above ground explosives, flammable fuels or chemical containers within one mile of the physical structure? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, have you been able to identify what the container is holding and the container's size?
☐ Yes ☐ No

13. Toxic Chemicals and Radioactive Materials

Are there any known hazardous materials, contamination, chemicals, gases, and radioactive substance on or near the site? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, explain _____

During the visual inspection of the site is there signs of distressed vegetation, vents or fill pipes, storage/oil tanks, stained soil, dumped material, questionable containers, foul or noxious odors, etc.

☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, explain _____

At this time is the site's previous uses known to have been gasoline stations, train depots, dry cleaners, agricultural operations, repair shops, landfill, etc.? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Are other funding agencies requiring the Grantee to perform an American Society for Testing Materials (ASTM) environmental assessment? ASTM assessment involves analysis of site uses and ownership, inspection of site, and possible testing. ☐ Yes ☒ No

14. Airport Clear Zones and Accident Potential Zones

Is the project located within a designated airport runway clear zone or protection zone? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Does the project involve acquisition of land or construction/rehabilitation of building or infrastructure in an airport runway clear zone or protection zone? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, is the grantee aware that the airport operator may wish to purchase the property at some point in the future as part of a clear or accident zone acquisition program? ☐ Yes ☐ No

15. Energy Efficient Designs

For building construction has the owner investigated possible incentives from power providers, such as Idaho Power, Avista, or Utah Power for incorporating energy efficient design into their building?

☒ Yes ☐ No

16. Sediment Control (Clean Water Act)

Will the construction project require storm and surface water discharge from the construction site?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, has an application to EPA been submitted for a Construction General Permit (CGP)?

☐ Yes ☒ No

17. Other Environmental Reviews

Have facilities studies or other environmentally related site reviews been conducted or in the process of being conducted? ___ Yes X No

If yes, are there any identified concerns or recommended mitigation measures? ___ Yes ___ No

List if known - _____

18. Information Letters

The advanced mailing of environmental information letters is sought in an effort to minimize the project's timeline in waiting for necessary documentation or information. It will assist in earlier responses to required mitigation measures should the proposed project receive grant funding.

Check the agencies that have been mailed an environmental information letter.

- X Idaho State Historic Preservation Officer
- X Tribal Historic Preservation Officer or Tribal Office
- X Idaho Department of Water Resources – Local Regional Office
- X Army Corps of Engineers (if wetlands are applicable)
- X U.S. Fish and Wildlife
- ___ NOAA Fisheries (if salmon and/or steelhead are applicable)
- X Idaho Fish and Game
- ___ USDA Natural Resource Conservation Service (if farmlands are applicable)
- X Idaho Department of Environmental Quality
- X Local Government – Planning Department
- ___ Others _____

Letters to the above checked agencies will be mailed out November 2009, however, no adverse impact is anticipated.

Completion of the scoping checklist does not constitute that all environmental provisions or clauses related to 24 CFR 58 Environmental Reviews have been met or are known at this time.

Shawn Charters, Grant Administrator
Completed By

November 20, 2009
Date

XV. Review and Ranking Narrative:

Part B: Forms

I. Program Impact

A-D is based upon information provided in Chapter 5. (No action required) Staff will calculate the points.

E. Eligible Activity Priority Ranking Sheet

Fill in the percentage of the project's budget that will be spent on the following activities. The Total Points Awarded column will be completed by department staff.

| Eligible Activity | Points Possible | Percentage of ICDBG Budget Spent on Activity | Staff Points Awarded |
|--|-----------------|--|----------------------|
| Acquisition of Real Property | 100 | | |
| Acquisition of Real Property for Housing Projects | 50 | | |
| Public Facilities and Improvements-Health and Safety Related | 100 | 42% | |
| Public Facilities and Improvements-Housing Related | 75 | | |
| Public Facilities and Improvements-Social Service Related | 50 | | |
| Engineering-Architectural | 100 | 50% | |
| Code Enforcement | 50 | | |
| Clearance and Demolition | 10 | | |
| Removal of Architectural Barriers | 50 | | |
| Rental Income Payments | 0 | | |
| Disposition of Property | 10 | | |
| Public Services | 0 | | |
| Completion of Urban Renewal Projects | 0 | | |
| Relocation Payments | 25 | | |
| Planning Activities | 0 | | |
| Administration Activities | 100 | 8% | |
| Grants to Nonprofit Community Organizations | 0 | | |
| Grants to Nonprofit Community Organizations for Housing Projects | 75 | | |
| Energy Planning | 0 | | |
| Housing Rehabilitation | 75 | | |
| Total Points Awarded to Project | | | |

Instructions: Complete the table below and include a ½ page narrative.

II. National Objectives: Complete the need and impact for the project type that is Public Facilities.

A Low and Moderate-Income Percentage Points: No Action Required.

B. NEED:

Drinking water supplied from three groundwater wells (Wells 6, 8, and 9) for the City of Emmett has odor and color that generates considerable consumer complaints. The drinking water contains:

- Sulfides that are suspected to contribute to hydrogen sulfide odors and black color,
- Sulfates that may potentially revert to sulfides in the water distribution system and create odors,
- Iron and manganese concentrations that may contribute to yellow and black color, and
- High free chlorine levels that imparts chlorine taste.

Hydrogen sulfide odors are very apparent at the well head of Well No.8 and are having an obvious affect on water users. Iron concentrations do not exceed the National Secondary Drinking Water Regulations (secondary standards) of 0.3 mg/l for color control. However, manganese levels slightly exceed the secondary standards (.05 mg/l) for color control in Well No. 8 and significantly exceed the standard in Well No. 9.

The City of Emmett discontinues use of Well No. 8 during low demand periods to minimize complaints to the City. The City is regularly reimbursing users for clothing that have been stained by the City water. In addition, the City has an extensive flushing protocol throughout the year to try and minimize the effects of odor and staining on users.

The water supply sources for the City of Emmett have serious odor, color, and taste concerns because of their elevated hydrogen sulfide, manganese, and iron levels. Though only manganese levels consistently exceed the National Secondary Drinking Water Standards established by the US Environmental Protection Agency and the other contaminants are considered individually as nuisance or aesthetic water characteristics, their affects in drinking water quality are amplified when in combination. For example, hydrogen sulfide concentrations reported in water from Well No. 8 act as an irritant to eyes and sensitive skin as well as contribute to odor. Therefore, the city utilizes heavy concentrations of chlorine to oxidize the hydrogen sulfide, but elevated levels of free chlorine also act as an irritant to sensitive skin as well as cause black manganese and yellow/red iron precipitates in the distribution system. Furthermore, the city utilizes phosphate addition to control the corrosive water characteristics that warrants further chlorine addition to control bacteria growth within the water distribution system. Hence, the affects of the contaminants in combination is perceived by many residences that their public water system is unfit and not safe for personal use. Unfortunately, this belief is growing because of greater yearly demand and use of Wells No 8 and No. 9. In

conclusion, engineering controls are necessary to remove the contaminants from the water system and allow moderate chlorine use for water system disinfection.

C. IMPACT:

This project will directly impact the entire population of the City of Emmett which is comprised of 63% low and moderate income individuals. Many of the residents are on a fixed income and cannot afford to fully fund the entire \$2,777,000 needed to fix the water quality problems. Currently the City is getting barraged with angry residents demanding the City pay for damages to the laundry and household appliances. If the project is not completed the City will be continue to provide dirty and smelly water which may result in health and safety violations.

III. Project Categories

A. Planning, previous actions, and schedule.

1. Design Professional Documentation in Appendix B

In 1999 the City of Emmett solicited RFP's for Engineering Services for Improvements to the City's Water and Wastewater Facilities. In November, 2009 the City decided it was time update the RFP process. Proposals were solicited and 26 firms responded to the request. Interviews were conducted November 17, 2009. Rating and Ranking sheets were completed by all seven member of the City Council and are being tabulated. A letter announcing the decision will be issued by December 1, 2009 and will be forwarded to the Department of Commerce for review. The RFP for Engineering services is documented in **Appendix B**.

2. Grant Administration Documentation in Appendix B

The City of Emmett has hired Shawn Charters to provide grant writing and grant administration services. Shawn has been a certified Block Grant Administrator for over 20 years and has successfully administered the last two ICDBG grants for the City. RFP's for Grant Administration Services were sent out to Certified Grant Administrators and proposals evaluated. Documentation of procurement is located in **Appendix B**.

3. Planning for specific project type: Complete only one of the following that corresponds to the project.

(2) Water and sewer: The City of Emmett contracted with Holladay Engineering and Tonka Water Treatment Systems to develop a Pilot Study Investigation that was conducted July 28th – August 8th, 2008. A copy of the Plan is included in **Attachment F**

4. **Environmental Scoping** checklist is included in the application.
5. **Agency Viability:** Complete only one of the following that corresponds to the project.

(1) Water/sewer: The City of Emmett and USDA Rural Development have completed a Rate Study. Please see the Rate Study included in **Attachment G**. The City has also completed the Financial Profile and is also included in the application.

The City held a bond election on August 5, 2009. Documentation can be found in **Appendix G**.

XVII. CERTIFICATIONS

I certify the data in this application is true and correct, that this document has been duly authorized by the governing body of the City of Emmett and we will comply with the following laws and regulations if this application is approved and selected for funding.

- National Environmental Policy Act of 1969
- Civil Rights Act of 1964 Pub.L 88-352
- Civil Rights Act of 1968 Pub.L 90-284
- Age Discrimination Act of 1975
- Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Section 504
- Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Act of 1970, as amended (49 CFR Part 24)
- Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended Pub.L 93-383
- Davis-Bacon Act (40 USC 276a - 276a-5)
- Historic Preservation Act
- OMB Circular A-87, and ensure that sub-recipient complies with A-110 and A-122

- Section 106 of the Housing and Urban Recovery Act of 1983 certifying to:
 - Minimize displacement as a result of activities assisted with CDBG funds by following the Idaho Department of Commerce's anti-displacement and relocation assistance plan;
 - Conduct and administer its program in conformance with Title VI and Title VIII, and affirmatively further fair housing;
 - Provide opportunities for citizen participation comparable to the state's requirements (those described in Section 104(a) of the Act, as amended);
 - Not use assessments or fees to recover the capital costs of ICDBG funded public improvements from low and moderate income owner occupants;
 - Abide by all state and federal rules and regulations related to the implementation and management of federal grants;
 - Assess and implement an Accessibility Plan for persons with disabilities in accordance with Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended;
 - Adopt and implement an Excessive Force Policy;
 - Prohibition of Use of Assistance for Employment Relocation, Section 588 of the Disability Housing and work Responsibility Act of 1998 Pub. L 105-276.
 - Anti-Lobbying Certification: No federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid, by or on behalf of the undersigned to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any federal agency, a member of, employee of a member of, officer of or employee of Congress in connection with the awarding of any federal contract, the making of any federal grant or loan, the entering into any cooperative agreement and the extension, renewal, modification or amendment of any federal contract, grant, loan or cooperative agreement.

If any funds other than federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any federal agency, a member of, employee of a member of, officer of or employee of Congress in connection with this federal grant, the undersigned shall complete and submit Standard Form-LLL, "Disclosure Form to Report Lobbying," in accordance with its instructions.

Signed by Chief Elected Official

November 18, 2009

Date

William Butticci, Mayor

Typed Name

APPENDICIES

Appendix A – LMI Income Survey

Appendix B - Public Hearing Notice, Publication & Minutes of Public Hearing

Appendix C – RFP for Professional Services

Appendix D – Fair Housing Resolution

Appendix E – Project Maps / Site Photos / Plans

Appendix F – Water Pilot Study

Appendix G – Cost Factors/Documentation of Match

Appendix H – Letters of Support